FORMER NEBRASKA ORDNANCE PLANT
RAB MEETING APRIL 6, 2006
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
5/23	Lynn Moorer	Meetings are being recorded. If you don't want to be on the DVD of this meeting then you might have to hide your face or something, but we have it recorded on DVD and we also have a transcriptionist that will provide a written transcript of the meeting. Mr. Anderson, how many of the DVDs are in the library now as you have said they are? And those were placed there when?	Garth Anderson	Just one copy right now. [According to] Mr. Bigelow, those were [placed in the library] two weeks ago.	The DVDs were placed inside binders and have since been clearly labeled so that they can be easily found on the library shelf. Additionally, a computer was installed in the Mead Library in July 2006. This computer contains the project administrative record and information repository. It also includes video (DVD) files and written transcript (PDF) files for recent RAB meetings. KCD will be saving future video and written transcript files on this computer along with other project files.
12/9	Chris Funk/ Lynn Moorer	Okay. Next item, the eastern plume…we did a series of direct push transects across this plume, the purpose of which was to refine and get a -- gain even more confidence in what that edge of the plume looks like. Let me go over here just to kind of show	Garth Anderson	We went -- it's kind of hard to see on this map, but we've taken transects all the way down to the end of the plume and even -- I'll come over here. We've even gone south of EW-1 to [County Road F], so we've done them here and all the way up the plume like that.	

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
		you… exactly where all these transects are that we 've pushed across the plume so you can get an idea of the spacing between sampling points and between the crosscut of the plume. How far down do those lines go? South of EW-1? How far south?			
15/18	Melissa Konecky	Garth, have you guys ever agreed on a definition of containment?	Garth Anderson	The work plan that we have submitted to EPA and NDEQ outlines what we think are the criteria for maintaining containment. EPA and DEQ are reviewing that plan, and they'll provide our comments and we'll sit down and continue to work out what those -- what those criteria and what those factors are for successful containment.	KCD provided a Draft-Final Containment Evaluation Work Plan to EPA & NDEQ on 29 June 2006. This Draft-Final Containment Evaluation Work Plan contains a working definition of containment proposed by KCD. EPA & NDEQ are currently in the process of reviewing this Work Plan (and the definition of containment). The Work Plan (and the definition of containment) will be finalized pending any comments from EPA & NDEQ.
16/4	Melissa Konecky	Because it just seems that either it would be in containment or not. I mean, do you have a definition?	Garth Anderson	I wish there was a simple definition, but there are we what call multiple lines of data, multiple lines of information that determine when you're in containment. As I	See follow-up response to 15-18

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
				mentioned before, we have -- we have the hydraulics of the groundwater, we have the measurement of the actual contamination to make sure it's not moving, and other factors.	
17/4	Lynn Moorer	I note that Mr. Marquess sent you a message after receiving [the draft work plan] and indicated…*I haven't come across a definition of containment in the work plan; is it included?* Did you get an answer to your question, Mr. Marquess? Is there a working definition in the work plan is the second question?	Scott Marquess	Just to give a little context, I sent that message -- I had not reviewed the plan yet, so that was my first reading, first blush at what I had seen or glanced at. I would say we provided comments to the Corps this week, and this week I sent comments to the comprehensive review of the work plan, and, you know, there are things in our estimation that will need to be revised in the plan to make it satisfactory in terms of the working definition of containment or however we're going to evaluate the performance of the remediation system.	See follow-up response to 15-18
17/22	Lynn Moorer	Is there a working definition of containment at this point?	Scott Marquess	Well, there's not a final document at this point, so there's a document that's in review that we've offered comments and suggestions and things that we think need to be revised in order to make the containment evaluation work plan more complete or to our satisfaction.	See follow-up response to 15-18
18/6	Lynn Moorer	Would you be so kind as to summarize for us or	Scott Marquess	One thing I can tell you that the ROD addresses -- and Garth	See follow-up response to 15-18

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
		paraphrase for us where the working -- what the working definition of containment is right now?		talked about multiple lines of evidence…the way we would look at containment would include a chemical monitoring component, which is, you know, the outline of the plume based on remediation goals that have been established, a chemical and a hydraulic component… Everything else in terms of hydraulics gets a lot more complicated, and I don't really feel I'm very capable of describing it in detail.	
20/15	Lynda Wageman	Help me to understand why we don't have a definition of containment.	Garth Anderson	That's a fair question. We have had working definitions of containment. We've been working with principally the -- doing the chemical monitoring along the south. Do we find anything south or east or anywhere else around the plume; if the containment hasn't spread that's a good working definition. What we're attempting to do with this containment evaluation work plan is improve not only our definition of containment but to have more --have better ways of measuring and grading our – our containment.	See follow-up response to 15-18
21/16	Lynda Wageman	So basically then what you're stating is the definition of containment	Garth Anderson	Yes.	See follow-up response to 15-18

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
		isn't necessarily the issue; it's the measurement of the containment or the measurement to define what -- what those containment parameters are; is that correct?			
21/23	Lynda Wageman	So if we know that in the ROD, the way the plume is sitting right now, it is not in containment in accordance with the ROD because the plume has moved outside of 5 and 2, so we know that in accordance with the ROD it is not in containment. So now what we need to do is we need to run a measurement saying what, since the ROD we've been out of containment X amount and this is where and this is why and this is how we're going to fix it, or we're out of containment to this degree and this level and this is how we're going to make sure that we don't get out of	Garth Anderson	Yes, first, we want to ensure that we stay in containment henceforth and forever more, and there are ways to -- that we want to measure that, both through chemical, hydraulic and modeling. Modeling is a tool, modeling is never the final answer to anything, and what do we do if we are out of the containment. And -- …And we acknowledge that Load Line 1 was out of containment, no question about that, we've agreed about that for a while. In concert what we're saying in our proposal is that when we do find ourselves out of containment, and this one is a pretty obvious case, what kind of response actions would we undertake to get us back into containment. And once we -- once we complete all of our sampling and we've run this -- this system for a short period of time, then we're confident that we have achieved a containment.	

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
		containment to this degree and to this level and in this arena; am I right?			
24/2	Lynda Wageman	So what's your benchmark then for containment? For what date, just the current measurements, or help me out here?	Garth Anderson Scott Marquess	Both the chemical and the hydraulic measurements of the extraction well. I think the answer you may be looking for may be the ROD…that map [on the wall] there generally depicts what's different now relative to the ROD.	
24/21	Lynda Wageman	So then your benchmark is going to be based on the data from EW-12 and 11 -- or 12 or 13, whatever the magic number is, starting this year; that's going to be your benchmark, your jumping-off point? Yes, no?	Scott Marquess	I think that's [a] fair [statement]. Also relative to the ROD, I think just south of the blue, that's new, and I think that's -- I mean, that was specifically allowed for in the design of the system. But that it was intended that if -- if the line -- you know, where the blue line where Garth was pointing was that the ROD -- there was never any intention in the -- in the approved remedial design, remedial action that that contamination wouldn't go from the blue line to the edge of the pink line because that's where the wells were put in.	
25/15	Lynda Wageman	So once again, your benchmark would be at the end of that pink line to establish a measure of	Scott Marquess	Yes. Shouldn't be anything beyond EWs -- no, the yellow or the pink -- or the purple, to the east. And the rest…of the equation is what makes	

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
		containment? Starting in 2006?		it difficult or what makes it hard isn't as much the chemical part… But the hard part isn't as much the chemical part, although there's a matter of the sufficiency and the density of the monitoring network, which needs to be improved; the harder part is the hydraulic part, which is cheaper information. You can -- and you can get it more frequently, but it's a lot harder to interpret, and that's kind of where the rub comes, what makes it more difficult to say, all right, well, how much -- how much lower should the elevation of Well X be compared to Well Y to say that we have gradient in the right direction on a regular basis. So -- but we want to have both the chemical and the hydraulic component because we -- the more tools and the more things we have to find, the more information we can get; we can get more hydraulic information, we can get chemical information, so we want to take advantage of that.	
28/7	Lorus Luetkenhaus	Would you promise me [A working definition of what you mean by containment by the next meeting]?	Garth Anderson	I'm not going to guarantee you anything because we want to be sure that the three agencies are in agreement with what the definition of containment is. We're confident that we'll be there by then, but -- if all	KCD provided a Draft-Final Containment Evaluation Work Plan to EPA & NDEQ on 29 June 2006. This Draft-Final Containment Evaluation Work Plan contains a working

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
				goes according to our schedule.	definition of containment proposed by KCD. EPA & NDEQ are currently in the process of reviewing this Work Plan (and the definition of containment). The Work Plan (and the definition of containment) will be finalized pending any comments from EPA & NDEQ.
29/22	Lynn Moorer	When the site management plan is finalized will you put it in print large enough to read?	Garth Anderson	We will provide both in paper and those that prefer electronically, we'll have that as well.	The approved SMP was passed out at the 13 JULY 2006 RAB Meeting. The SMP can also be found on the project web site. *http://www.nwk.usace.army.mil/projects/mead/projectindex.html* A special version of the SMP documents will be created in a format that is readable from a standard printer. The current version was developed for printing on larger paper (11x17), which is not typical on most home computer systems.
33/8	Chris Funk	Do you know, was my [ski] lake sampled in one of those two samples?	Mary Lyle	I believe we sampled that last summer, July.	This data was provided to Ms. Funk later during the meeting.
34/12	Melissa Konecky	Well, I noticed that there were a couple of water supply wells that were particularly high in TCE,	Mary Lyle	The [surface water locations] that we see, the detections that are consistent are SW-6, which is right here inside the plume in Johnson Creek, SW-8;	This data was provided to Ms. Funk later during the meeting. A hard copy summary of all

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
		and then I noticed – and I have to find the pages, but some of those surface water results were really high too, and I'll have to find the page just so I have the specifics.		those are probably the ones that are high. Around 40 and 50 are what we've been seeing in the last probably year and a half that we've been out there. We also had some detections in SW-10, which, again, is within the plume.	surface water sampling data was passed out the 13 July 2006 RAB Meeting.
35/21	Chris Funk	Have you ever tested Johnson between where it runs out of the plume and through not plume and then back into the plume?	Garth Anderson	We'll have Brady run that number [for SW-4 & SW-5], and we'll get you a level here before the end of the meeting.	
41/14	Melissa Konecky	When you guys take these surface water samples do you do it the same way like the NRD goes out and takes like a sample from the stream, from each -- you know, from the middle and the sides, or do you go out into the lake and just take a sample from the same point each time or - Like a lake or whatever?	Mary Lyle	It is the same point each time. In the creek we have a gauge where we mark where we've sampled previously, so we'll go out and try to, as close as possible, repeat that very same sample every quarter.	
41/19	Melissa Konecky	You know, I noticed like it looks like there's a lot of vinyl chloride in some of these samples of surface water, and I wasn't sure, you know,	Mary Lyle	I'll have Brady run [the database on] that. I'm not familiar with the vinyl chloride.	No vinyl chloride has been detected in surface water samples.

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
		what -- what numbers -- you know, where the points referred to, but, I mean, I'm sure it's way above action levels according to my sheet I printed out from the EPA.			
42/3	Chris Funk	So when you say it's above action level, what do you do; what action are you taking?	Garth Anderson	Well, surface water, there's -- probably shouldn't use the term action level on surface water right now anyway because there is no established action level. In fact, the only regulatory limit right now that the -- you know, for state water quality is higher than we would even be comfortable with, so what we're doing is working with EPA to run -- determine a level based on realistic exposure and realistic use of the stream and how people would be exposed to that contamination to determine what -- what level would be -- would not cause elevated risk. So right now that level is -- we're in the same -- the preliminary calculation kind of showed the same order of magnitude as what we're seeing as kind of a screening level, but we're going to get more definition on that as we work with EPA to develop that.	KCD, EPA, and NDEQ are developing an action level for TCE in surface water. Under the currently approved site Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment, current TCE levels fall within a generally accepted risk range.

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
43/4	Lynn Moorer	I would respectfully request yet again that whenever the Corps presents the results, which we're anxious to hear at each of the RAB meetings as to the latest sampling that you have done, please be prepared to tell us specifically the chief findings each time.	Garth Anderson	When we talked to -- again, this is going to be a regular feature at every RAB meeting. We shifted everything by a month so that as our quarterly sampling results come in, it's -- it correlates to a RAB meeting. So the July RAB meeting will be a little more specific. We'll still come with lots of -- with maps to talk from, the database and all the rest, but our brief and slide, we'll try to highlight some more specifics findings; that should not be difficult.	
44/13	Lynn Moorer	I just want to note for folks who might be interested to know, you may remember at least a couple meetings ago we had quite a discussion about the Artesian Well…and there was a big concern about whether or not at the action level -- it was approaching action level and then it went up to 5, well, the -- I think one of the chief things that folks might want to know is then the fourth quarter 2005 result is now -- it's at 13, 13.7, at that	Scott Marquess	Generally, you know, contamination is flowing north to south, we have source areas in the north. I'll just – I mean, you should expect to see contamination mass moving north to south over time either to the extraction wells in the main part of the RDX plume, same thing everywhere; that's the way it's going to work. So if we have, you know, right now -- So contaminants moving this way, we should expect to see the wells to the south increase in concentration…So don't look at this as -- this is not all the same, this is not a homogenous. There's a small area through here that's concentrated, and we can manage that; that's the	

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
		Artesian Well. Why is it increasing and at the rate that it is increasing?		part that you can address.	
48/23	Dave McReynolds	[Water supply well] 54 has been high for a long time; are you trying to tell us that 54 has gone down and it's pushed on farther south, because this has gone up, you know, and it is south and east of that?	Mary Lyle	These residential wells are located within the plume, if they're the ones that you're talking about, and they do receive carbon treatment. And so every time these -- in the homes we have two carbon units, and so that when the water comes in, it goes through the first one and then it goes through the second one, and then the people are able to use the water. We always sample in between the two carbon units so that we can monitor breakthrough. If we start to see detections that make us know that we need to change that first carbon filter treatment, then that's what that data tells us. There's still -- even if we see detections, they're still protected by the second carbon unit, but we always monitor in between, and sometimes we monitor the water before it goes into even the first one, which I suspect is the data that Melissa was referring to earlier. So those higher concentrations we know are coming in already to the carbon unit, but those people are not at risk	Water supply well 54 was sampled for TCE and RDX, when we sampled that, those were both below 1 part per billion in 2005. These results refer to post treatment samples. Due to privacy issues, KCD will not discuss specific results of private water supply wells in the future. Discussion of the water supply well sampling program will be limited to generalities. KCD will only discuss analytical results from water supply wells with the well owner one-on-one.

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
				because they're protected by the treatment system.	
50/13	Melissa Konecky	That's quarterly that the people's water supplies are being tested?	Mary Lyle	To get back to Melissa's question about the carbon unit sampling, in 2005 we sampled the before, which is probably that higher data that you saw two times, and then in between quarterly, the in between sample quarterly to monitor for breakthrough.	
50/25	Lynda Wageman	The question regarding the [Artesian] irrigation well is this: Is it currently being used as an irrigation well, does anybody know?	Mary Lyle	Yes, it is.	
51/20	Lynda Wageman	I want to know since the Corps knows that this is an active irrigation well and the Corps and the EPA know that it is being registered at 13, I want to know how the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, is going to do precisely that, protect my environment. What are you going to do with this irrigation well; are you going to halt it, minimize it, slap a carbon filter on it, what?	Scott Marquess	We have other sites in Nebraska where we use irrigation wells as a remediation tool to strip the volatiles from the groundwater as it's sprayed up, and we checked on this a while back.	

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
55/2	Lynda Wageman	so I guess basically what you're telling me is we do have an irrigation well in a dangerous location that's still being used to irrigate fields that are going to be cultivated and processed for food to give to other people, and we shouldn't be remotely concerned about it?	Scott Marquess	I don't believe that there's a significant risk posed by that condition that you just outlined.	
60/19	Lorus Luetkenhaus	On this plume up here, we've got U, we've got J, we've got UJ, we've got under action levels; none of that is shown up here…would you please depict that on a map for us in the future?	Garth Anderson	We can attempt to do a meaningful depiction. I don't know if it'll be meaningful, but I don't -- what we're trying to depict here is how we're containing the plume and where it is, if it's above the regulatory limit.	Currently, KCD is focused on depicting the portion of the plume that is at or above action levels for the purposes of containment and compliance with the OU2 Record of Decision. In the future, KCD may consider depicting the plume below action levels in the future, but it is not our intension to do this in 2006 or 2007.
64/9	Lynn Moorer	I recall seeing a document that mentioned a half-mile line, and I remember it having something to do with the context of EPA; is that an EPA-lead issue?	Garth Anderson	The one-mile buffer zone sampling will continue, and what we -- a concept we came up with is we drew another line that's in between the one-mile and the plume, we just call it a half-mile line--Lisa is pointing to it--and residential wells that are inside the half-mile line, we're going to be sampling semiannually, and those on the other. The one-mile	This concept was proposed by KCD and approved by EPA and NDEQ in the development of the 2006 Groundwater Monitoring Program.

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
				buffer zone sampling will continue, and what we -- a concept we came up with is we drew another line that's in between the one-mile and the plume, we just call it a half-mile line--Lisa is pointing to it--and residential wells that are inside the half-mile line, we're going to be sampling semiannually, and those on the other.	
66/20	Lynn Moorer	Early in the meeting on your little fact sheet here it says Item 2, the status report on EW-12 and EW-13, you -- it says, EW-12 is extracting more water than was originally expected. So I have two questions: What was projected, what did you expect, and then what is the actual?	Brady Bigelow	Right now we're pumping at 325 during the start-up, we're pumping right at the design rate.	The statement that EW-12 is extracting more water than was originally expected should have read, "EW-12 is CAPABLE OF extracting more water than was originally expected." EW-12 is currently extracting water at 325 gallons per minute, which is what it was designed to extract, however the well is able to extract more than that if necessary in the future.
68/13	Dave McReynolds	There's several of us that'd like to know Monitoring Well 85 ---- because at 2/26/05, it was five times the limit.	Garth Anderson	What we did, we did have a hit in MW-85 that was above the action level, and what that did was it triggered additional sampling on our part so that we could understand why it was high. In a case like this, if we have something that seems unusual, like, for instance MW-85, first thing we do is we go out and resample the well. We want to make sure that that is, in fact, a true piece of data,	The well in question, MW-85B, was sampled initially after installation in November 2004. The data was received by the lab and validated in December 2004 and January 2005. In February 2005, KCD reported to EPA and NDEQ that the well had a detection of 10 ppb. Again, the detection was from a sample collected in November 2004. All

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
				because sometimes other things happen like a lab may screw up, something is transcribed wrong. There are a number of things. So we go out and sample it several many more times to make sure that is a true result. In addition, we -- we -- we went out with some direct push sampling, that's where we put a geoprobe down in the ground and collect samples at various depths to ensure that there's nothing up gradient or beside it or around it that would have caused that kind of spike. And after doing that investigation just last year we found that that MW-85…was really nothing to indicate there was something unusual going on that we had broken containment. We haven't seen any levels like that since in any of our sampling. I'd like to answer another question the Dave McReynolds asked about Monitoring Well 85. Since then the levels in March, June, and November of '05 have all been consistently between 1 and 1.4.	subsequent samples collected at and around MW-85 have been below the RDX action level of 2 ppb.
70/1	Dave McReynolds	Is it there in two levels?	Scott Marquess	The ten [ppb of RDX] was only in one [depth interval], the 85B. There were detections at 1 to 1.4, and other wells [depth intervals] -- and you can	

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
				see the data here, you know, if you'd like to look at it later, that well at that location, and then all the sampling that was around that	
71/11	Dave McReynolds	So you're telling us that Extraction 3 is going to take care of that problem, that it's not going to get any higher down there at 85?	Garth Anderson	Yes.	With the all the data we have collected to date in this area, KCD believes MW-85 will remain below action levels in the future.
72/13	Lynn Moorer	Mr. Anderson, I ask that all the questions be answered out loud to everyone like that.	Garth Anderson	Sure.	Scott Marquess: I want to make sure that everyone here knows that EPA is perfectly willing and able to discuss with any one of you one on one any questions that you have or anything that you'd like to have answered individually. It doesn't all have to be as a group, and we're perfectly willing to talk with you one on one, and it doesn't have to be in a group setting. GARTH ANDERSON: And, of course, the Army extends the same offer, that's why we have the open houses before the RAB meeting. If your schedule doesn't accommodate coming to the meeting, and -- or if you have a complex question that you may want us to help you answer, so

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
					we can go up the map and spend a little time discussing it and maybe running the data on our computer.
	Lynn Moorer	I have a more general question -- this is MUD's take on their status of compliance with Condition No. 26, which is under the area of natural resources and mitigation. And it says, both Kansas City and Omaha districts of the Corps of Engineers have also concluded that the baseline modeling, meaning MUD's baseline modeling, which reflects pumping within these restrictions, will not adversely impact cleanup operations at the Mead NOP site. Mr. Anderson, do you agree with that at least with respect to -- from the Kansas City Corps?	Garth Anderson	Yes.	With the all the data we have collected to date, KCD believes the M.U.D. well field will not adversely impact cleanup operations at the Mead NOP site.
83/1	Lynn Moorer	I contrast those statements to something that's in a document that's dated February 13, 2006,	Garth Anderson	I disagree with that because these are -- those are actually two completely unrelated issues. The meeting that we had with EPA, that discussion	

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
		and this is a letter from Gene Gunn at USEPA Region 7, and it's his memorialization of a meeting that was held December 12th, 2005, between the Kansas City Corps and DEQ and EPA personnel, and it -- and one of the topics that was discussed was the groundwater cleanup time frame… On the one hand you are saying that you are confident that you know where this plume is going, you'll know very early in the process where it moves, yet you -- and you agree with MUD's statement that their pumping is not going to adversely impact the cleanup operations at the NOP site, yet you are unwilling to agree to an enforceable time limit or shall we say making the cleanup time frame be an enforceable criteria that you all have to adhere to.		would have been exactly the same had…MUD been pumping or not. The question is, yes, there is uncertainty in fate and transport modeling, and that's where contamination actually goes, and the question at hand was how long will it take -- through the pumping that we're doing here, how long will it take for this plume to eventually come down and finally completely disappear through -- through the operation of the extraction wells. There's -- right now we're trying to get a -- we're getting a better handle on the interior of the plume now that we have containment fairly well in place. So we're looking -- the question is how -- given that the makeup of the plume, the composition of this plume and these other plumes, how long does it actually take for the -- for the contamination to get drawn down through here and into the -- into the extraction wells. Now, that -- the fate and transport modeling is not an exact science because there are a lot of other factors. You can't just look at hydraulics. Fate and transport of actual contamination, there are other factors such as dispersion, dilution, retard -- well, it's a factor called	

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
				retardation…but it's held up by the soil as it moves through the -- you know, [downgradient] toward the extraction wells. The -- so that question was just an interpretation of the ROD, whether 130 years was an enforceable number or a goal, and we're…working on ways that will reduce our anticipated restoration time of the plume…Right now if you talk about the…[M.U.D.] modeling that we've reviewed, that it really doesn't influence the plume as we have it in place today. So therefore our cleanup would continue as it is, and it would really not be affected by the MUD pumping, so those are two completely independent questions.	
86/23	Lynn Moorer	Title 118, which is a part of the Nebraska regulations, indicates a 20-year period is a reasonable time frame for completing groundwater cleanup. Twenty years, and the lowest so far that you all have been projecting is about a hundred and thirty, and some of your estimates have said six hundred and fifty years to clean it	Garth Anderson	No.	

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
		all up. So I see that as a very, very large gap between 20 years that DEQ is suggesting as a reasonable time frame; have you all agreed that the OU2 ROD should be reopened in order to specify a 20-year time frame for cleanup?			
87/12	Lynn Moorer	What is -- what is your response to DEQ's regulatory authority with respect to this 20-year period that they think is the reasonable time frame?	Garth Anderson	Technically unfeasible. And DEQ acknowledges the technical infeasibility of the 20-year. The 20 years is really based on sites that are nowhere near this magnitude. This is 11 square miles, and just the travel time of water from here to here is greater than 20 years.	Alyse Stoy: You're right, ideally a 20-year time frame is what is stated in Title 118, but it also says -- I don't have it in front of me, but it does have the -- or whatever reasonable time frame it is, and in this type of site it's a very large, complex site. So when Scott and myself, as the attorney, we look to see what is an enforceable time frame here. The technical part has to come into play to figure out what is -- what -- just as Garth just said, what is technically feasible in order to achieve a cleanup goal. In this case, the goal is to achieve MCLs. So in this instance, the ROD – the 1997 ROD certainly identified a much longer time frame, and we do have other cleanups where we, in

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
					order to achieve a clean up, have to go and look to beyond a 20-year time frame. But what Scott has been working with the Corps on for some time is to figure out what is the combination of what is technically feasible combined with how do we get the cleanup achieved in—as quick as possible, as a non-technical term.
93/24	Lynn Moorer	But it is still possible that it may need to be reopened?	Garth Anderson	The process allows for RODs to be modified if the circumstances warrant. The national contingency plan, the CERCLA process allows for that.	
96/24	Melissa Konecky	Garth, are you…saying that in order to be an official RAB member people have to, like, express an interest?	Garth Anderson	Yes.	
97/10	Melissa Konecky	So in other words, Lorus, as he sits here, and Nadeen and Victor are not RAB members?	Garth Anderson	That's correct. We would certainly welcome their participation as official RAB members if you'd like to fill out an interest form, and -- so we can designate you as official members of the board, certainly.	
97/18	Melissa Konecky	You know, I can't remember filling out an interest form.	Garth Anderson	You did. [In] 1997, everyone that submitted an interest form in 1997 when we formed the RAB was invited to join, and we welcomed you and Kay Moline and Ross	

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
				Rasmussen and several others onto the board, and in about 1998 I believe Kay had to resign as the co-chair because of other duties, and the board elected you as the co-chair.	
100/16	Lorus Luetkenhaus	On your water model, you have experts in Omaha that can read a water model, correct? Or build a water model? So there's no problem here, you got a lot of information, if we say we want a three-layer water model here, you could build -- they could build it for us? Let's build a water model between the plume and their well field and let's have a draw-down map showing when they're pumping 104 million gallons a day, which they're permitted to, when there is low flow in the river, when there's no flow in the river, after 30 days of no flow, and after 60 days of no flow, which they are permitted	Garth Anderson	You can create a water model however -- you know, whatever your requirements are, you can make it. Is it the right model? Don't know… Yes, people can build a three-dimensional water model. You're talking about our water model that we use to manage the site or are you talking about MUD's groundwater model?... they are two separate models for two different purposes, although they're looking at a problem from different sides.	KCD will continue to update the site groundwater model for the purposes of managing the site. Currently, KCD does not intend to replicate the M.U.D. model for the purposes of simulating the Platte River going dry.

Page/ Line #	Speaker	Question	Responder	Initial Response	Follow-up Response
		to do, and then let's see what we come up with.			
104/12	Tom O'Hara	Do you want to point out the numbers has changed so if people have difficulty contacting [KCD]?	Garth Anderson	…any numbers that you have for the [Kansas City District] Corps of Engineers that has a prefix of 983 should now be 389.	Garth Anderson's new phone number is 816-389-3255.